

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

I. Claims 1-4, 7-13, 15-21, 24-28 and 30-32 Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-4, 7-13, 15-21, 24-28 and 30-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0143643 to Catan (hereinafter, “Catan”) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0016812 to Schmidt et al. (hereinafter, “Schmidt”). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the above claim amendments and the following remarks.

In amended claim 1, a “first object identifier” is “read[] ... to obtain first data while the object identifier reader is not connected to the host computing device.” The “first data” is “stor[ed] ... in the storage medium.” At some point “after the first data is obtained but before the first data is sent to the host computing device,” a “second object identifier” is “read[] ... to obtain second data.” “[I]n response to determining that the object identifier reader is connected to the host computing device,” the “reader ... automatically attempt[s] to send the stored first data and the second data to the host computing device.”

Thus, one advantage of amended claim 1 is that the “first data” that is obtained by “reading a first object identifier ... while the object identifier reader is not connected to the host computing device” is “stor[ed]” and then “sen[t] ... to the host computing device” at a later time, when “the object identifier reader is connected to the host computing device.” This is true even if a “second object identifier” is subsequently “read after the first data is obtained but before the first data is sent to the host computing device.”

The subject matter that is being added to claim 1 by amendment is supported by at least paragraph [0044] of Applicants’ specification, which states: “[T]he object ID reader 104 is configured to automatically determine whether to send or store data 116 that are obtained by reading object IDs 102. The object ID reader 104 may also be configured to automatically send data 116 that are stored in the storage medium 114 to the host 106. An object ID reader 104 that is configured in

this manner may be useful in a wireless environment where the user may move in and out of connection range of the host 106. When the object ID reader 104 is connected to the host 106, data 116 may be sent to the host 106. When the object ID reader 104 is out of range, data 116 may be stored in the storage medium 114 and then automatically uploaded to the host 106 when a connection can be established again.”

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Catan and Schmidt does not teach or suggest “automatically attempting to send the stored first data and the second data to the host computing device in response to determining that the object identifier reader is connected to the host computing device,” as recited in amended claim 1. The Office Action correctly acknowledges that Catan does not teach or suggest this claimed subject matter. (*See* Office Action, page 4, lines 1-3.) Schmidt does not make up for the deficiencies of Catan.

Schmidt describes a “wireless laser scanning bar code symbol reading system ... employing a 2-way RF-based data communication link between its cradle-providing base station 792 and its wireless hand-supportable code symbol reading device 791.” (Schmidt, paragraph [0616].) “[T]he reader’s system control software always stores in its memory its current ‘link status’ with the base station.” (Schmidt, paragraph [0620].) “When the data transmission activation button 330 is pressed after a valid read, the system control software first checks the wireless link status. If the link has been established, which means that the base station-receiver is in range, then the wireless bar code reader transmits the stored barcode data immediately. If the link has not been established, which means that the base station/receiver is out of range, the wireless reader does not attempt to transmit the barcode data. Instead, it periodically checks the link status until either a link is reestablished and the barcode is transmitted, or until a new barcode has been read and old barcode data discarded.” (*Id.*; emphasis added.)

Schmidt may perhaps be interpreted as teaching that a first object identifier is read to obtain first data, and that if the object identifier reader is not connected to the host computing device, then the first data is stored. However, Schmidt also teaches that, if a second object identifier is read before

the first data has been sent to the host computing device, the first data is discarded. In particular, Schmidt states that when “a new barcode has been read,” the “old barcode data [is] discarded.” (Schmidt, paragraph [0620].) Thus, in the situation where first data is obtained by reading a first object identifier while the object identifier reader is not connected to the host computing device and second data is obtained by reading a second object identifier before the first data has been sent to the host computing device, Schmidt teaches that the first data is discarded and only the second data is sent to the host computing device when the object identifier reader is connected to the host computing device. In contrast, amended claim 1 requires that both “the stored first data and the second data” are “sent” ... to the host computing device in response to determining that the object identifier reader is connected to the host computing device.”

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 1 is allowable. Claims 2-4 and 7-13 depend from claim 1, and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Independent claims 15-18 and 30-32 are each being amended to recite “automatically attempting to send the stored first data and the second data to the host computing device in response to determining that the object identifier reader is connected to the host computing device.” As discussed above, the combination of Catan and Schmidt does not teach or suggest this claimed subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claims 15-18 and 30-32 are allowable. Claims 19-21 and 24-28 depend from claim 18, and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 18.

II. Claims 5-6, 14, 22-23 and 29 Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 5-6, 14, 22-23 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Catan in view of Schmidt and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. to Zhu et al. (hereinafter, “Zhu”). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the above claim amendments and the following remarks.

Appl. No. 10/806,303
Amdt. dated April 30, 2010
Reply to Office Action of December 30, 2009

Claims 5-6 and 14 depend from claim 1. Claims 22-23 and 29 depend from claim 18. As discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 18 are allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 5-6, 14, 22-23 and 29 are allowable for at least the same reasons as presented above in connection with claims 1 and 18, respectively.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims in the present application are in a condition for allowance, which is earnestly solicited. Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 30, 2010

By: /Thomas M. Hardman/
Thomas M. Hardman, Reg. No. 51,777
(801) 931-5475

AUSTIN RAPP & HARDMAN
170 South Main Street, Suite 735
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101